

THE AMERICAN

VOL. II.—NO. 49

PHILADELPHIA, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 1881.

PRICE, 3 CENTS.

NOTES.

WITH the exception of a slight increase in his bodily temperature on Saturday and Sunday evenings, which the doctors at first ascribed to the heat of the weather, Mr. GARFIELD continued to improve and to gain in strength throughout the past week. On Monday, they found it necessary to lengthen the opening previously made, so as to discharge another pus-cavity in the wound, and at this writing they report his condition as excellent. There has been an abatement of the newspaper criticisms on his medical attendants, but no cessation of the disposition to make stock-jobbing capital out of anything that can be construed as indicating that he is in danger. Never was there a case in which doctors and patient were so closely watched. Whatever gains there may be or may not be to the science of traumatic surgery, there has been a remarkable diffusion of information on the subject among the American people. The professional mysteries of speech and of knowledge have been popularized to an extent which should suggest to our physicians the possibility of educating the whole community in at least the elements of physiological and medical science. The existing relation of the doctor to society is an absurdity. We but half use his skill when we employ him merely to cure the sick and heal the wounded. He should be much more employed in teaching the public the avoidance of disease and healthful modes of living. Every church in the country should be opened at least once a week for such instruction. There could be no more appropriate use for churches dedicated to the name of Him who "healed all manner of sickness and of disease among the people."

THE vote in North Carolina has resulted in a sweeping defeat of Prohibition. Even in the districts in which the strength of Prohibition was believed to lie, its defeat has been decisive, and the returns from the back counties will only increase the majority against it. Evidently the state of public opinion was not such as to give the measure a chance of success. The opponents of the liquor traffic talk of continuing the struggle until the taverns are closed. They ought to be able to see that, before North Carolina can be induced to put an end to the liquor traffic, the social and intellectual atmosphere of the State must be changed. The colored voters, in particular, must be brought up to a higher moral level. They are free, indeed; but they retain the vices which slavery taught them, and which they inherited from the barbarism which preceded slavery. They generally have no end in life, except to get the most accessible enjoyment in the largest quantities. Even their religion is but one of the ways in which they indulge themselves. Their season of passionate excitement and their sensuous hymn-tunes are not far from kin to the roast racoon and the bottle of apple-whiskey. Like the creed of almost all the undeveloped races, their faith has little to do with conduct. No colored man ever mentions another's religion as a guarantee of his honesty. Religion does not present itself to them in its stern aspect as the power which demands self-sacrifice and imposes the cross. It comes chiefly as one of the many means of having a good time. We do not say this in any spirit of censure or of contempt. We hardly see how it could be otherwise. But it is as well for us to be aware of the truth that the method we took for the reconstruction of the States which went into the Rebellion, involved a great addition to the already large body of voters, who feel no call to the sacrifices and self-denials which make men public-spirited citizens.

PUBLIC attention has recently been called by a writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* to the lax methods of administration which prevail in the poor-houses of the country. In a general review of the matter, it will be found that the rich Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the very worst in this regard, although the wealthy Commonwealth of Illinois is trying hard to do still worse for her poor. Any resident of the Keystone State who is in danger of an excess of pride in this Commonwealth, should get the volume published yearly by the State Board of Charities, and read their statement of the condition of our county jails and poor-houses. He will find the same wretched story told year after year, with hardly any variation. He will read of grand juries presenting these very edifices as nuisances, and urging that they be rebuilt, or at least improved, and that abuses whose mischief is known to every one should be got rid of. And when he turns to the report of the same county a year later, he will find that nothing has been done. Take, for a sample, the account of the Bucks County prison, as given year

after year in these reports. Some day, some Englishman will take a run through these places, and, in the spirit of JOHN HOWARD, print his notes of what he saw; and then we will all flame up in indignation, call him a malicious libeller, and perhaps begin to mend a "system which destroys men, ruins women and corrupts children,—a system which tortures helpless lunatics, and sends to an overcrowded world hundreds of children doomed to the horror of long lives of hereditary vice, deformity and madness."

THE annual gathering of the philosophers at Concord, Mass., under the presidency of BRONSON ALCOTT, brings together about as remarkable a set of people as could be gathered into any one spot of this planet. Most of them have no claim, which would be recognized by the philosophic guild, to the name of philosopher. In this list we might put Mr. ALCOTT himself, Mrs. JULIA WARD HOWE, and others who illustrate Mr. LOWELL's lines:

"Salt of the earth, in what queer guys
Thou'rt fond of crystallizing."

There are people who have perhaps some capacity for abstract thought, but have never undergone the training needed for its right development. Of the history of philosophy, they know little or nothing; yet they have the great names at their fingers' ends, and can talk of PLATO, HEGEL and KANT with the best. But, in curious association with these dilettante philosophers, we find genuine students, like Mr. MULFORD and Mr. HARRIS, with whom philosophy appears in its true character, as the science of all sciences, whose hard-won results have accumulated from age to age as the fruitage of earnest thought on the highest problems. This year, the centenary of the publication of KANT's "Critique of the Pure Reason," gathers to Concord many who have not been there before. There could be no better illustration than KANT furnishes of the character of genuine and lasting work in this province. His work in refutation of HUME's skepticism, and of the sensationalist theory of knowledge, is a possession forever. But it was hard writing and is not easy reading. Few dilettante students have read beyond a few pages of the "Critique." Yet philosophers are continually going back to KANT as to a writer whose significance cannot be exhausted. No man has ever refuted KANT. Many have ignored his conclusions. But merely empirical theories of knowledge have been "living with the brains knocked out" since 1781.

THERE will be contests for fifteen seats in the next House of Representatives. Of these, thirteen will be from the South, Alabama alone furnishing four. We hope the Republican majority will have the good sense to settle these contests on the footing of absolute justice. They can do without these seats; they cannot afford to take one of them without satisfactory proof that the contesting candidate received a majority of the votes actually cast. It is of no use to talk of voters terrorized and thus prevented from appearing at the polls. That may be good reason for declaring the seat in question vacant, but it is none for seating the contestant.

One of these contests will be easily settled. Mr. CHALMERS has represented the Shoestring District of Mississippi long enough. Even the Democrats are disgusted with the means he has used to secure, not an election, but a certificate of election. It is certain that he cannot rally to the support of his claims even the Democratic minority of the House. Mr. CHALMERS is aware of this, and sees that something must be done. So he has made a bid for the support of the Greenbackers of the House, by coming forward as the Greenback candidate for Mr. LAMAR's seat in the Senate. The chances of Mr. CHALMERS becoming Senator from Mississippi are about equal to those of his being appointed Sheriff of Mecca, and he knows this. His candidacy is merely a bid for support which he badly needs.

We think Mr. Clerk ADAMS of the House has done exactly his duty in putting Mr. CANNON, and not Mr. CAMPBELL, on the rolls as delegate from Utah. While the Governor of the Territory has given his certificate to the latter, there can be no doubt that the *prima facie* case justifies Mr. ADAMS's course.

THE Republican Convention of Virginia meets to-day at Lynchburg, but it is impossible to predict the result of its deliberations. The most contradictory accounts of its constitution are telegraphed, apparently from the same source. The truth seems to be that two conventions

have been chosen instead of one. The friends of coalition claim three-fourths of the Convention, but, as there will be contesting delegations from nearly every district of the State, the result will depend a good deal upon the measures taken in organizing the Convention. It is most probable that there will be a bolt on the part of the faction which fails to get a majority of the Committee on Credentials, and this, perhaps, is as good an outcome of the situation as could be expected. A simple coalition of Republicans and Readjusters would be a national calamity; but little will be lost by letting the dissatisfied Republicans slough off and join the Readjusters.

The regular Democrats have shown poor judgment in putting forward Mr. DANIELS, an unmitigated Bourbon, as their candidate for the Governorship. This, surely, is a time for moderate men and moderate measures. Their platform reads well enough. Besides pronouncing for the assumption of the whole debt at three per cent. interest, they declare for equal rights and a free ballot. Some Republican newspapers profess to ridicule this profession of readiness to have the colored citizens exercise the right of suffrage under the conditions prescribed by the laws. We may be misinformed, and, if so, we shall welcome a correction but we have never understood that the colored voters of Virginia were either terrorized from approaching the polls, or failed to have their ballots counted. Their grievances have consisted in the maladministration of the laws by certain police magistrates or county judges now no longer in office, and in the enforcement of the law which imposes a capitation tax on every voter at his registration. This last issue we do not think large enough to form a basis for a coalition.

THE death of Gen. ROBERT PATTERSON removes one of the historic figures which recall to Philadelphians a past generation. He had served his country with honor in three wars,—the second war with Great Britain, the war with Mexico, and that of the Rebellion. While he was ardently attached to the Democratic party, and remembered all the glorious days of its earlier history, he was both a strenuous Protectionist and a fervid supporter of the measures taken for the maintenance of the Union. He was a man of great kindness and geniality, combining, in the years in which we knew him, the liveliness of youth with the resources of old age. As a native of Ireland, he cherished a warm attachment to his native country; as a Presbyterian, he was equally devoted to the interests of his church. He was one of that obstinate Ulster stock which has done so much to build up the material prosperity of Pennsylvania. He was not, as *The Ledger* absurdly says, a Celt; his very name tells of his Norse descent. He was descended from one of the Lowland Scots who settled in Ulster in the times of the first STUARTS, under pledges of an interest in their lands, which the land-owners broke without regard to truth or right. He was the last of a group of old residents, such as few cities had to show,—MORTON McMICHAEL, JOSEPH T. CHANDLER, HENRY C. CAREY, WILLIAM T. LEWIS,—men of different creeds and political associations, but bound together by mutual sympathy and a cordial respect.

HARTMANN, the Russian Nihilist, who is known to have been an accomplice in several unsuccessful attempts on the life of the late Emperor of Russia, chose an unpropitious time for visiting the United States. With the exception of Mr. WENDELL PHILIPS and a Rhode Island militia surgeon, the Nihilists have no admirers among the people of the United States. The recent attempt on the President's life has deepened greatly the feeling against political assassins. Of course, if Russia makes no demand for the man's surrender, we cannot send him back; and since her unsuccessful attempt to secure his rendition from France, she has allowed him to reside in England without taking any steps to secure his arrest and return. But the feeling of the American people about his presence was shown in the urgency to know from the State Department what they meant to do about it. The answer was just what every American would approve. Neither the absence of an extradition treaty with Russia, nor the plea that his offences have been political, will save the man from extradition if Russia should demand it, and can give sufficient proof that he has been guilty of crimes condemned by the civilized world. It is reported that this answer disturbed the equanimity Herr HARTMANN has acquired during his long residence in England and France, and led him to betake himself once more to the protection of the British flag in Canada. We do not believe that Canada will relish this use of her territory as a refuge for such miscreants. She showed her spirit in surrendering American criminals at a time when England had terminated her extradition treaty with America in order to protect smugglers from our laws. But her misfortune is that she has no diplomatic relations with Russia. She is a dependency, not a nation, and whatever her masters prescribe in such matters she must accept.

ON one point, Canada may fairly claim to be ahead of the United States. We mean her system of post-office savings banks. It went into operation in 1868, when 81 such banks were established in as many post-offices. At present, 307 post-offices have these savings banks, with deposits amounting to nearly six and a quarter millions of dollars.

The Government pays four per cent. on deposits, and the expenses amount to about one-third of one per cent. The Dominion is thus enabled to borrow a considerable sum of money at a lower rate of interest than it could obtain in the money-market, while it offers the absolute security for repayment which no private corporation can give. At the same time, it enlists a large body of the people on the side of public honesty and good faith. There are nearly fifty thousand depositors. A similar system is needed in the United States, and bills for the purpose of its establishment have been before Congressional committees for several years past. But they never get any farther than the committees; and no Postmaster-General has shown any disposition to urge the passage of any of them. Here is another grand opportunity for Mr. JAMES.

It is not easy to get from the English journals a clear idea of the effect of American competition on the land-owning, the farming and the manufacturing interests of Great Britain; but a striking article in the July number of the *Quarterly Review*, entitled "English Trade and Foreign Competition," shows how grave the crisis is. The writer estimates, for example, that during the past ten years no less than a million of acres in Great Britain and Ireland have gone out of cultivation altogether. In thousands of cases, not only have there been great reductions, but rents have been largely remitted, arrears have been allowed to accumulate, and every kind of indulgence has been extended to the tenant. Many a landlord has not been receiving the half of his rent roll. Nor is the distress confined to the landed interest. Canada, a large market for British goods, has adopted a tariff which, the reviewer asserts, is almost as injurious to the English manufacturer as that of the United States itself, and France, as is well known, is about to raise her duties on imports to figures which seriously threaten the interests of Great Britain. It is clear, from all the signs of the times, and especially from the confessions in this noteworthy article,—which, after all, is merely a plain statement of facts which the English press mostly ignores,—that the farming and manufacturing interests of England are passing through trials which may amount almost to a revolution. Nevertheless, it would be folly to jump to the conclusion, as some of our American journals do, that the sun of British prosperity is about to set. She still has her coal and iron, her enormous and increasing carrying trade, her possessions in India, and, above all, her accumulated capital invested in productive securities in all parts of the world. But the turning point has come, and the superior natural resources of the United States are at last beginning to tell in the race between the two great English-speaking nations of the world.

THAT the House of Lords have gone too far in the alteration of the Irish Land Bill, is felt even by their friends of the Tory press. The amendment preventing the Court from setting aside existing leases, if it think them unjust, may be accepted by the Commons. But several others will not be. Lord SALISBURY has ingeniously wiped off the bill every trace of the doctrine that the tenant is to be regarded as having some rights in his holding, and has thus deprived the Land Commission of their proper basis of procedure. The change does not look great, but it deprives the measure of its proper character, and would vitiate the whole plan of land reform proposed by Mr. GLADSTONE. On such amendments the Commons must show fight.

The unfairness of the cable dispatches is shown by the suppression of many important facts in favor of the Land League party. One of these was the report of the commission sent over to Ireland by the Cleveland Miners' Association, one of the largest of the English trade-unions. They conclude by declaring that their observations show the Irish to be an oppressed, but not in any sense a lazy, people; that a good Land Bill is needed for the improvement of their condition; that the reports of outrages are greatly exaggerated, and that the Irish everywhere, and without distinction of religious party, should unite in upholding the Land League. This report is the more significant as the Irish have been threatened with the vengeance of the English artisans if they did not show themselves more manageable. The English artisan, like the English cardinal, has blessed where he was expected to curse. Cardinal MANNING's expression of his sympathy with the League has created great dissatisfaction among the aristocratic Catholics of England. They are generally Conservatives; he was before his conversion a Liberal, and still inclines to that view in politics. And, as a churchman, he is aware that even in England there are two Irish to one English Catholic.

PRESIDENT CALDERON of Peru deserves the sympathy and support of the civilized world in his efforts to lift his unhappy country from the prostration and anarchy in which she has been plunged by her war with Chili. All his acts thus far seem to show that he is worthy of the choice which selected him for the painful task, and is aware of its magnitude. The dictator who brought this misery on the country is still a pretender to the supreme authority, and has received some support from Bolivia, on whose behalf he began the war. But the sister republic has given promises of a change of her policy in this regard.

DIVORCE IN NEW ENGLAND.

IT is worthy of note that Dr. WOOLSEY's advocacy of an inter-State convention, to secure uniform divorce laws throughout the country, is largely based upon the condition of things in New England. That section of the Union, instead of being "left out in the cold," is thoroughly warmed by the fervid philosopher. Though the divorce law reform associations there which he commends, show that some good has come out of all this alleged evil, yet their effect has thus far been inconsiderable. It does not appear that they have been able to develop a public sentiment on the subject which is likely to be soon crystallized into statutes. And without such a change in public sentiment, legislation cannot be expected to do much toward reform. It is certainly a suggestive fact that the current of divorce in this country, which, a few years ago, ran so strongly Westward, should now be surging in the East. Indiana and Illinois can no longer boast that facility in legally untying the nuptial knot which made them such welcome resorts for mismatched couples. The gibe about railway trains stopping five minutes for divorces has lost its point, even in Hoosierdom. It is New England, not the West, that, when finding the grasshopper of matrimony a burden, is able to lightly throw it off. The Down East-er has outstripped the Westerner in a practical application of the doctrine of the unfitness of things to the relation of husband and wife. The cuteness of the Yankee has left behind in this respect the go-ahead-ative-ness of his relatives by the Great Lakes. While the "Wooden Nutmeg" State has one divorce to every eight marriages, Chicago has to content itself with one to twelve. It is, however, Maine, the home of prohibition of liquor-selling, that allows the utmost license to that sale of souls which is carried on under the name of divorce. There is something exceedingly suggestive in this combination of rigid temperance legislation and lax matrimonial bonds. In fact, the connection between opposition to rum and friendliness to what is practically free love, is well worth consideration by our social philosophers. The relation of women to those two questions which have a vital bearing upon the home, is not the least significant aspect of the problem in the Pine-tree State. The rest of New England, though lagging behind Maine in the proportion of divorces to population, yet exhibits a tendency to emulate her example in this respect. Thus, while Maine had in 1878 one divorce to 1,357 of its inhabitants, Rhode Island had one in 1,411, New Hampshire one in 1,439, Connecticut one in 1,552, Vermont one in 1,705, and Massachusetts one in 2,896. Since 1878, there has been such a tendency to equalize the disproportion indicated by the above figures, that, according to the recent investigations of Rev. Mr. DIKE, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island have alike divorced one to 11.7 of the population. The old Bay State has become so lax in its legal requirements for the dissolution of the nuptial bonds, that divorce has made great headway. The consequence is that, while marriages have hardly increased 5 per cent. since 1860, divorces have increased 200 per cent. Of course, there are differences of opinion as to the significance and tendency of this state of things. Old-fashioned clergymen and judges see in it a lamentable pandering on the part of Legislatures to the free and easy spirit of modern society. One of the justices of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts lately animadverted from his seat on the bench on the dangers of that social condition which developed such evils. And now the Legislature have, in a small way, tried to do something to correct the evil. Their measure, however, is so mild as to suggest Mrs. PARTINGTON's attempt to sweep back the Atlantic Ocean with her broom. It only proposes to prevent people against whom divorces have been obtained, from marrying within two years from the entry of the final decree. This would hardly dampen the ardor of husband or wife in seeking relief from the matrimonial halter through acts which might well debar them from repeating their experiments upon human gullibility.

It is, of course, an open question how far legislation can properly be expected to remedy evils which have their root in social conditions of which laws are only the reflex. Yet in cases where the law has put man and wife asunder, it would seem to be only a reasonable protection for the community that the guilty party should be obliged to show some other reason than a little lapse of time for undertaking the responsibilities of matrimony. The root of the evil, the facility with which divorces are secured, is not touched by the law lately passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts. It is a familiar truth, that, when persons

know that they cannot easily dissolve their nuptial bonds, they will be more likely to cultivate those habits of mutual consideration which are the foundation of matrimonial happiness, than if they are constantly tempted by legal facilities for breaking those bonds. If, in addition to these facilities, legislation enables them to readily marry again, the security for faithfulness in the relation of husband and wife is seriously weakened. In fact, the new law in Massachusetts is a direct encouragement to divorce, and can only be defended on the ground that it is the duty of the State to enable persons who have violated their marriage vows, to continue in the business as long as possible. It has generally been held that the object of marriage is a permanent provision for the union of the parties, as the stability of society is largely dependent upon such permanency. Divorce in this view is only a means of promoting the general welfare of married people by eliminating the conditions which impair the integrity of matrimony. In countries like France, where divorces are not allowed, it is found that unfaithfulness in the marriage relations is more common than among nations which permit them. Moreover, the number of "separations" among French married people is notoriously greater than that of divorces in other European countries, so that the *thing* not only exists under a different name, but its evils are aggravated by the lack of those provisions for the protection or relief of innocent parties which are the only justification for it. The guilty secure all the advantages of the family property and name, while the barren satisfactions of freedom are left to those who are without the means of enjoying it. Traditional associations alone keep republican France from throwing off those terrible social evils which are due to the absence of a sound system of divorce. Since M. NAGUET began his agitation of the question, five years ago, he has seen the majority against his measure diminish so largely that its success is only a question of time.

The problem of divorce in New England naturally presents difficulties wholly unlike those which complicate the question in France. In the one case, legislation has fostered the tendency to liberal indulgence in matrimonial infelicity, which has its outcome in easy legal separations. In the other, the lack of such facilities has developed customs which make marriage a cover for gross violation of its essential objects. Yet the consequence of once opening the flood-gates of divorce, as illustrated in the experience of New England, might well make conservative Frenchmen hesitate to try the experiment. Regulation of the current being difficult, it is easy to understand the persistence in that damming-up policy which has made matrimony in France a pool of social demoralization. Yet, on the principle that laws are never much at variance with the practical needs of a people, it would be foolish to dogmatize about the shortcomings of Gaul or Yankee in a matter which involves too many and too complex considerations to be settled by a complacent snap-judgment. It is a curious fact, and one that confirms the view that legislation can only carry out social reforms which are already rooted in popular sentiment, that, in those States of New England where divorces are most common, lax legislation has either not been a factor in the problem at all, or has simply come in to intensify the prevailing tendencies of society. Thus, though there has been no relaxation in the rigor of divorce laws in New Hampshire for more than a century, yet divorces have increased there as much as in States where statutes have favored the loosening of matrimonial bonds. It is a problem, therefore, how far lax legislation in Massachusetts and other States is responsible for the growth of the alleged evil. Although such legislation may be regarded as injurious by giving a legal sanction to separations which would otherwise be more or less disreputable, yet its very looseness tends to develop the public sentiment which is alone capable of permanently checking any social evil. The famous omnibus clause in the divorce laws of Connecticut, which practically left all legal sundering of the nuptial bonds to the discretion of the judge at the trial, opened the flood-gates of matrimonial infelicity so wide as to fairly frighten public sentiment into its repeal in 1878. In that year, more divorces were granted in Massachusetts and Connecticut than in England and Wales together.

It will not do, however, to pronounce too dogmatically against the freedom of divorce in New England. This is only one of the factors in the complex problem of social development, and its relation to other factors must be known in order to determine its character for good or evil. A committee of the Massachusetts Legislature reported several years ago that the laxity of divorce legislation not only tended

to increase the number of marriages, and thus to diminish licentiousness, but also promoted the happiness of the parties. Rev. Mr. DIKE, on the other hand, brings forward statistics to show that, while population has increased 50 per cent. in Massachusetts during twenty years, general crime has increased 20 per cent., and offences against chastity 124 per cent. Statistics of this sort, however, cannot be satisfactorily connected with a single social condition, and a more careful tabulation is needed to show the relation of cause and effect as bearing upon the subject of divorce.

The influence of race is an important element in this consideration, and it should be viewed in reference to general social development rather than to any particular features. Thus, Rev. Mr. DIKE makes the point that the New England stock on the Western Reserve in Ohio exhibits the same laxity in regard to divorce as in its original home, while the counties frequented by Welshmen and Southerners exhibit no such tendency. And yet, in the totality of its development, the New England population is superior to the other elements. In fact, according to Sir HENRY MAINE, the tendency to divorce is a product of a high civilization, and especially of Protestant civilization, which, in its indulgence of this tendency, combats the restraints which, in Catholic countries, cramp the legal freedom of parties to the marriage contract, but do not, therefore, promote their happiness or morality. It has been confidently assumed that individualism is disintegrating the family in New England, and that divorce is sapping the foundations of public prosperity and virtue. Such generalizations are too sweeping to be sound: The conditions of American society are not yet sufficiently fixed to permit of conclusions so plainly inimical to its permanent welfare. As the diminution in the size of New England families, which has been such a bugbear of social pessimists, has been explained on salutary economic principles, so the existing conditions of marriage and divorce are by no means proofs of the deterioration of society, but are rather indications of a period of transition in its development. There is no necessity for adopting *Punch's* memorable advice to persons about to marry,—"Don't!"—in view of these matrimonial infelicities. At the worst, they need only inspire that degree of caution which is desirable in facing any social peril.

THE LEGISLATIVE PAY QUESTION.

THE controversy between the Attorney-General of Pennsylvania and the members of the Legislature, over the question of pay for the latter, is curiously illustrative of the extent to which popular belief in legislative demoralization has gone. For it is very evident that, except for this, there would be little or no reason for the controversy. In some way, it is supposed, the Attorney-General is striving to punish the Legislature for its sins, and to restrain it from doing further damage to the public interests; and his proceedings therefore receive an applause which otherwise no one would think of bestowing upon them.

The Court of Dauphin County has now ruled, on the first argument of the question, in favor of the Attorney-General. The point argued was substantially this: "Is pay by the day *salary*?" The State Constitution provides simply that "the members of the General Assembly shall receive such salary and mileage for regular and special sessions as shall be fixed by law, and no other compensation whatever." This leaves the subject to the charge of the Legislature, its duty being to "fix by law" how much the salary and mileage shall be. The Constitution, it may be worth while to remark, does not set any limit to the length of the sessions, nor to the amount of the salary. The recent discussion of the issues raised by the Attorney-General has apparently created an impression that one or both of these points were guarded, and that the Legislature was endeavoring to evade them by sitting too long, or by appropriating to itself a larger sum than was allowed; but in point of fact it is within its power to sit continuously throughout the year, and to fix (the payment, however, not to apply to the enacting session, but its successors,) any amount of salary it may see fit.

The present statute on the subject of salary is that of May 11th, 1874. The Legislature then in session was the first after the adoption of the new Constitution. Under the provisions quoted above, it addressed itself to the duty of "fixing by law" the amount of salary which members should receive. The matter was fully discussed, and, considering the *personnel* of the Legislature, which contained some men of acknowledged ability, including Mr. WALLACE, since United States Senator, it must be said to have had a very thorough and able consideration. It did not enter the heads of the members, of course, that they were not framing the law in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution; on the contrary, this was precisely the work to which they were addressing themselves. When the law came to the hands of the Governor—

Gen. HARTMANFT,—his Attorney-General was Mr. DIMMOCK, regarded as a sound lawyer and high-minded man. If any doubt had been entertained as to the Constitutionality of the bill, and apparently there was none, Mr. DIMMOCK's approval of the form of its provisions, preceding the Governor's signature, must have removed it. The consequence was that the Legislature then sitting drew its pay according to the terms of the law. The salary was presumed to be "fixed" as the Constitution directed. In 1875, the Legislature was again paid according to the same provision, and so, as each subsequent year arrived, were the Legislatures of 1876, 1877, 1878 and 1879. Now, the law of 1874 provides:

"That the compensation of members of the General Assembly shall be \$1,000 for each regular and each adjourned annual session not exceeding one hundred days, and \$10 per diem for time necessarily spent after the expiration of the one hundred days; provided, however, that such time shall not exceed fifty days at any one session."

In this form of words lies the whole question which has got into the courts, and which is to be further argued before the Supreme Bench. It is an ingenious, hair-splitting controversy of no real importance,—except to the members of the Legislature, who naturally want to get the pay that the law assigned them at the time of their election,—and which would not have arisen, in all probability, except for the common impression, already referred to, that the Legislature's badness makes any attack upon it, not only justifiable, but meritorious. The public will gain nothing of any great value by the dispute, though it is possible that, if the Supreme Court should sustain the Court of Dauphin County, and pronounce the law unconstitutional in part, a new bill would be passed, and the salary fixed at a less sum than \$1,500 for a session of one hundred and fifty days. This, however, is one of the uncertainties of the future. For the present, the dispute is confined simply to the question whether the provision in the clause of the Act of 1874, quoted above, in reference to pay by the day after the expiration of one hundred days of session, is "salary" or not. For the Constitution authorized the Legislature to fix salary and mileage only. Obviously, pay by the day is not mileage. It must, therefore, be salary, or it is not Constitutional. This is substantially the whole of the point at issue. The Attorney-General takes the ground that the law of 1874, having fixed the lump sum of \$1,000, made that the "salary," and that compensation per diem, after the hundred days, is of another character entirely, and not allowable. In such a controversy, there can be no great public interest. It does not bring up legitimately the question whether the Legislature now receives too much or too little, for it is plainly enough a mere question of legal construction of language,—the Court being set to ascertain whether the Legislature, in 1874, used such a formula as it really supposed itself to be doing, and what it was directed to do by the Constitution.

An aspect of the subject, however, is entitled to further remark. This is that the members of the Legislature, whatever other crimes, high or low, they may be chargeable with, individually and collectively, are certainly not blamable for asking to be paid according to law. They presume, as everybody must, that a statute duly enacted is the law, and is entitled to obedience. Under any other theory, society would fall into chaos very soon. Being confronted, however, by the Attorney-General with the declaration that the law is not framed in Constitutional language, the obviously proper course is to test the question in the courts, and to press it to the only tribunal whose construction of the Constitution is authoritative. This is manly and straightforward; there is now room for criticism upon the step only because it was not instantly taken when the Attorney-General procured the issue of his opinion. The unfortunate habits into which legislative leaders are apt to fall, caused them to try various experiments to "get around" the issue, instead of boldly facing it and abiding by the Supreme Court's decision. This episode, however, is nothing material to the present aspect of the case. It now stands as a suit in which the members of the Legislature have the law on their side—a law not of their making, at all, but which was enacted some years ago, and was used for the payment of six previous sessions. Under the well-defined and very valuable principle of the new Constitution, that the pay and emoluments of a public officer shall not be increased or diminished during his term of office, the members of the Legislature, being elected in 1880, and finding their compensation provided for in a statute that had been in operation since 1874, naturally presumed that this matter was fixed. They could get no more pay than the law provided when their term began; and of course they expected to receive no less. And as the obtaining by legal methods of what a person regards as his right is not usually considered anything but reasonable, we are bound to apply the rule, without doubt, even to our Senators and Representatives in the General Assembly, now that they have gone to the Supreme Court to ascertain what their rights are.

What we should hope for and strive to bring about, is a Legislature whose character would compel a reform of the popular estimate. The time has been long enough in which the great law-making body of such a State as this creates for itself so low an opinion of its virtue, its dignity, and its devotion to the public interest, that it is esteemed a good act to strip its members upon the technical and newer interpretation of an old law, of part of the compensation which they were promised by

its clauses, and which everybody had expected they would receive. Such a Commonwealth as this—with its imperial breadth in area and interests, with its population verging upon four and a half millions, and with the inspiration that ought to survive two centuries after William Penn laid its good foundations,—is entitled to a law-making body whose membership could not be set in the pillory of reproach. When we shall succeed in obtaining such an one, there will be no possibility of the popular applause following a movement to deprive its members of part of their legal compensation.

"BRICKS WITHOUT STRAW."

WHEN the children of Israel were in bondage in Egypt, the hardest exaction which the tyranny of their task-masters imposed upon them, and the one which they most bitterly resented, was the order to make "bricks without straw;" that is, to perform a given task without the requisite materials for performing it properly being supplied them. The present can hardly be considered an age of oppression, but, on the contrary, an age which has contributed much to the political, religious and intellectual literature of mankind, and has set its face strictly against tyranny and despotism; but, in spite of all this, it sometimes seems as if men had only changed masters. The very essence of liberty is that a man is his own master, and free to dispose of his destiny as he pleases, in as far as circumstances will permit. But if circumstances are overpoweringly strong, and condition him about so closely that he cannot move hand or foot, it seems to make little difference whether they are imposed by the sovereign will of a single master, or the laws of that many-headed ruler, society, the despot of modern States. In the midst of enlightened and industrious communities, there exists a large class who may say, with the Israelites: "There is no straw given unto thy servants, and they say unto us—make brick." The saying of St. Paul that, "unless a man work, neither shall he eat," is even truer for the toiling millions to-day than when it was spoken; and since then the conditions have widened to include women also.

In the various departments of cheaper manual labor that require but little preparation and special training, the peculiar difficulties of a woman's position are not so severely felt. It is a matter of course that the daughter of a poor laborer should earn her own living, and it requires very little preliminary education to enable a girl to go out to service or into a factory, or to learn dressmaking or tailoring, or some such occupation. But these difficulties are most acutely felt by people of a grade or two higher in the social scale, and by the unprosperous of the better classes. There are so many wives and daughters and mothers, women of more or less refinement and education, who would willingly add something to the slender income, or who are obliged to maintain themselves, and sometimes to undertake almost the entire support of a family. It too often happens that women are left penniless by the death or misfortune or misconduct of those who are supposed to be their natural protectors, and they are thrown upon their resources with absolutely no preparation for any sort of occupation. It is to these women that society says: "They shall make bricks; but they shall have no straw. They must work; but they shall not be taught how to work."

In these days of the systematic differentiation of labor, the anomalous position of woman is more obvious than formerly. The incongruity between the vocation that nature apparently intended for woman, and the position that man has assigned her, and the work that she is practically called on to do, is more than ever conspicuous. Every man of average wealth and intelligence—except the very wealthy class, which is numerically small,—looks forward to a life of work of some kind as his normal future. He is the natural "bread-winner," and, whatever may be his tastes, principles or inclinations, the necessity of work stares him in the face; he anticipates it from his childhood, and prepares himself accordingly. In a primitive civilization, the natural future of woman is the profession of wife and mother, the duties of which are certainly quite sufficient to tax to the uttermost any amount of physical or mental capacity which a woman may happen to possess. But the standard has changed with altered circumstances. The duties of domestic life and maternity are still the monopoly of woman, but it is no longer her only sphere. As the difficulties and complications of living have increased, and as most civilized countries have become overstocked with inhabitants, men have ceased to regard indiscriminate contributing to the population as the primary duty and most sacred function of every individual, as it was considered in the time of the Jewish dispensation. Consequently, there are numbers of women who do not engage in their normal occupation, and who must depend upon their own exertions for their support, not being provided for by the natural "bread-winner."

It is unfortunate that in this age, in which the division of labor has been carried to its highest perfection, the sphere of woman's work has not yet been sufficiently differentiated. We have not yet professional wives and mothers who are specially trained with a view to filling these difficult offices, or who are practically adapted to the duties of domestic life. Now, although every woman does not marry, every woman may, and there is a very general impression that it is hardly worth while to

bring up a girl with any definite occupation or purpose in life, or to prepare her for any special department of work, when she may at twenty adopt a profession which is supposed to require no particular preparation beyond a certain amount of good-will, where her previous training would be only so much time and money thrown away, as all her energies will now be concentrated in either saving or spending her husband's income.

But, while every woman may marry, a great many do not, in matter of fact; and these are the women who suffer from having had no particular direction given to their education. Every one who has ever had personal superintendence of any of the industries in which women may take part,—engraving, wood-cutting, decoration, and art-work of all kinds, high and humble, journalism, clerk-work, etc.,—has had melancholy experience of the numerous dreary, helpless applicants who constantly ask for work, and expect to be employed, absolutely without preparation, supposing that they can acquire in a few days or weeks the skill or routine that are the result of years of patient, persevering labor. They too often feel hurt and offended if it is suggested to them that they should begin at the foot of the ladder, and consider their necessities and their willingness to work as sufficient recommendation, and cannot always be made to understand that it is steady, consecutive application that constitutes skilled labor, and that it is only skilled labor that can command money in an often overstocked market. Any one who has had experience of the admirable manner in which women can perform work of this kind when they have subjected themselves to the same preparatory training that men think necessary, will not deny their capacity for this kind of work, and for the best of its kind. It is the want of concentration of purpose and settled resolution from childhood, that is so fatal to women in competing with men in the numerous departments of modern labor which they share. The very motives that act as an incentive to a man in choosing a profession and preparing himself for it, discourage a woman from devoting her life and energies to such a pursuit. The ordinary man goes to work because only by work will he be enabled to marry and undertake the cares of a family, and enjoy the pleasures of domestic life. If a woman throw herself with energy into the same kind of work that requires some years of preliminary training, with a prospect of modest success more or less remote,—if she feel any interest in her work, and steady desire for progress,—or if she have a grain of ambition to attain excellence,—she seems to be renouncing the prospect of domestic life, and those cares and occupations that are the natural lot of woman, and to which most women aspire.

A woman can hardly do more than one thing at a time; and this holds in all classes of society. Men are less restricted in their choice. A man may pursue both business and pleasure, may have a profession and social enjoyments, virtue and vice, if he be so inclined, wide experiences and family life, liberty and paternity. But a woman who sets her heart upon any one of these things, must almost of necessity renounce the rest, and must be content with either the business or the pleasure, the virtue or the vice, the freedom or the maternity. If all parents of modest means who cannot expect to leave their children independent, would bring up their daughters as well as their sons to some definite occupation, and have them thoroughly instructed in that, women would be happier and less helpless, there would be less husband-hunting, and their whole faculties would not be concentrated on petty economies or the effort to appear to live better than the family resources admit of. And it is very certain that no woman would make a worse wife or mother for having gone through such mental discipline. The vacancy of women's minds, of which we hear so much, their love of gossip and interest in insignificant trifles, is nothing inherent in their primitive structure; it is simply a natural result of the circumstances of their lives, of their attention being concentrated on the smallest details of living, and their minds being totally undisciplined by the thorough mastery and intelligent exercise of any regular occupation. It is very much to be doubted if the masculine mind, superior in its ultimate molecular structure as it is supposed to be, would escape degeneration if exposed to the same deteriorating influences.

Ever since literature has existed, woman has been one of its principal themes; and it is curious to note the various kinds and degrees of estimation in which she has been held in the different stages of the world's history—sometimes as a household utensil and a mere agent in the increase and perpetuation of a race; sometimes as the ornament and luxury of life; a necessary evil in the age of spiritual enthusiasm, and in modern times the centre of family and social life. She is abused and roughly handled by one generation for the qualities that are the admiration of another; but through all the blame and praise runs the constant thread of insistence on her mental as well as physical inferiority. But we must bear in mind that the literature of the world has been mainly written by men; and we all remember the answer of the lion in the fable, when his human travelling companion, as a proof of man's superior strength, pointed to a statue that stood by the wayside, representing a man choking a lion: "Ah, friend," said the lion; "if we had had the making of that statue, the lion would have been uppermost."

In the last twenty years, much has been done to remove the most serious obstacles from the path of those women who have the instinct of

work, and who have sufficient ambition and determination to renounce domestic life, and to devote the selves to the most severe mental labor.

Several Continental universities, Newnham and Girton in England, Wellesley College and the Harvard Annex in this country, have gone far to solve the problem of higher education for women; and the medical schools have opened an immense field for the activity of the most energetic and resolute of the sex. But the education of the vast proportion of women of the middle class is sadly without definite direction, and is too often limited to the cheap, showy accomplishments that are taught at convents and a multitude of boarding schools, in which is included very little that can be practically useful in domestic life, or can serve as a preparation for any occupation in which a girl can earn a living. This matter of education is of infinitely more real importance in the question of the emancipation of women, than the power of voting, or any such empty political privileges. If the time has come when women must compete with men in the struggle for existence, it seems only fair that the weaker combatants should go into the contest at least as well equipped as their more powerful competitors.

LITERATURE.

RUGBY, TENNESSEE.

THERE has been a great deal of interest taken in Rugby ever since Mr. Thomas Hughes actively began operations to add a new colony, a new influence, to those that already dominated the Cumberland Plateau. Those interested may readily be classed as enthusiasts and skeptics, the majority being with the latter. It certainly cannot be denied that distinctive communities are not looked upon with particular favor in this country; and when the avowed object of philanthropy is placed first, and the getting of a living, money, competency, second, Americans are immediately predisposed to doubt the success of any community that follows such a belief. When the happiness of mankind and the health of infants is considered the chief end and aim of selling milk,—which is the foundation-principle of Mr. Hughes's plan,—the average American dairyman will smile. And the stories that drift up to the North, of how the Rugbeans manage, with stealth and some artifice, to obtain a drink of spirits,—which is a cardinal crime at Rugby,—do not tend to strengthen the belief that everything progresses as admirably and smoothly as Mr. Hughes would have us believe in the little book—"Rugby, Tennessee; being some account of the settlement founded on the Cumberland Plateau by the Board of Aid to Land Ownership, (limited,)"—that has come to us from Messrs. Macmillan & Co.

The prime object of Mr. Hughes's work in Rugby is to start young boys aright in the world. "Go through any English county," says the author, "and you will scarcely find a family which does not own one or more cadets of fair average abilities, good character (the downright scapegraces having decidedly diminished,) and strong bodies, who are entirely at a loose end, not knowing what in the world to turn their hands to." This is unquestionably true; and it is the mission of Rugby to find these young fellows the exact something they are in need of to which to turn their hands. Mr. Hughes desires to take the boys when they leave school, in all the freshness of their young athleticism, and place them at once face to face with nature as vigorous, as fresh and unconquered as themselves. He does not think it so profitable for them to proceed to the already established communities into which the vices and cares of the Old World have been imported; nor does he omit to notice the "danger and cruelty" of allowing a youth "to wander out haphazard, with a few pounds and a letter or two of introduction in his pocket." But he holds with Mr. Emerson, whose words he quotes, that "to begin the world anew, as he does who puts the spade into the ground for food," is the one remedy for all this legitimized inevitable idleness—the non-occupation of those who are at the age and in the circumstances which make occupation most necessary,—which is eating the heart out of England. In regard to Rugby, one of the colonists says, in a letter that Mr. Hughes quotes, that the settlement is full of capability; stock-farming, timber-cutting, "growing," as Mr. Blackmore has called his genial trade of market-gardening,—and in the future the prospect of mineral wealth enough to pay every exertion tenfold,—are at the choice of the new settlers. The first idea of the Board and its sanguine president was that a young man with seventy-five dollars,—twenty-five dollars to clear him of all communal expenses, fifty dollars to keep him for the few weeks that would elapse before he could get into satisfactory employment,—would be amply provided. But experience has taught that a year's probation under an experienced settler, at a cost of about three hundred dollars, is the safest and wisest beginning. There is plenty of hard work ready for everybody—roads to be made, the town to build, the fields to cultivate, jobs enough to occupy every new comer; there is a carefully organized system of social life, perhaps too perfect, affording not only protection and peace, but excellent society; and there is a church, where all denominations are to worship together in amity, or at least to occupy the building turn about, which is perhaps the nearest advance to that state. The only prohibition amid all these privileges is in respect to that bane of civilization,—drink. Macmillan & Co., New York, 1881.

THE THREE AMERICAS RAILWAY.—Not long ago, Mr. Hinton Rowan Helper, of St. Louis, conceived a scheme of gigantic proportions,—no less than a plan for a "longitudinal, midland, double-track steel railway through North and Central and South America, from a point on or near the western shore of Hudson's Bay, to such part of the northern bank of the Straits of Magellan as may be equi-distant between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans." Of course, the great majority of people will laugh at the mere mention of such a scheme,—at the idea of excursion tickets from Hudson's Bay to Patagonia; but possibly Mr. Helper's scheme may yet be a reality. A railroad

through South America and Central America, to join Mr. Jay Gould's Mexican system, would practically put in operation Mr. Helper's idea, though not in his way. Mr. Helper is so impressed with the importance and necessity of his plan, that he has issued a book on the subject, ("The Three Americas Railway,") and, in order to have his own views backed up by some good writers, he offered \$5000 in cash for five prize essays on his scheme. These are included in the book, together with much commercial matter and a good deal of the redundant Mr. Helper. The book and its plan form a curiosity, and doubtless interest a certain audience. The volumes are well bound and printed. W. S. Bryan, St. Louis, 1881. Pp. 473.

BABY RUE.—The latest-named of the "No Name Series," bears the partly irrelevant title of "Baby Rue," and is quite as good as any of its predecessors. Two motives are apparent as having been the inspiration of the author; the first the development of the influence of heredity in the person of the hero, Stanislaus Leszinsky, and the second to draw a strong picture of frontier life among the Indians, in which the treatment of the Indians by the white men is introduced in semi-tones, which are, however, distinct and strong, and convey a moral. The Indians who ornament the story belong to the same magnificent savages that Cooper has made immortal,—

"The stoic of the woods, the man without a tear,"—

and their well-drawn characters win a place with the reader at once. These are not the Indians of to-day,—not the braves of Sitting Bull's band,—and are, therefore, much more interesting figures. The plot of the story is the abduction of "Baby Rue," and her final restoration to her parents. It is well told, in good style, and is above the average of the American novel. Roberts Bros., Boston, 1881. Pp. 299 and appendix.

PATTY'S PERVERSITIES.—This, the latest edition of the "Round Robin Series," is a thoroughly bright, readable American novel. Patty, the heroine,—who is not, to our way of thinking, half so attractive as another young lady, Flossie Platt, who is a small, dainty, attractive Boston young woman, with a habit of saying funny things, such as where she declares that she has not dyspepsia because of any indiscretion on her part, but because of the too many good dinners her father ate before she was born,—marries the hero, of course, and the reader's interest is excited to see how she does it. The good people get all they want, the bad are discomfited, and the reader rises thoroughly satisfied with the changes in a very charming story. The book is printed and bound, like its predecessors, handsomely. James R. Osgood & Co., Boston, 1881.

LORIMER AND WIFE.—This is a novel with a conventional plot, which is not remarkable in any important particular, but is interesting throughout, and, once begun, must be read to the close. It is a novel that will occupy an hour or two quite agreeably. George W. Harlan, New York, 1881.

POPULAR FALLACIES.

THE great comet of the present summer has done its full share in exposing popular ignorance. In matters of science, it has been a great puzzle to many people how the same comet could, in the evening, be in the *north-west*, with its tail pointing upward, but leaning toward the *east*, and, in the early morning, in the *north-east*, with its tail leaning toward the *west*. This has given rise to the belief, often heard in conversation, and even sanctioned by leading newspapers, that there have been two comets, one visible in the evening, the other in the morning. So excellent a paper as the *Baltimore American* says, in a recent number, under the heading, "The Two Comets Again Seen at Sea," that the mate of a British brig just arrived in port, "confirms the statement made by the mate of the 'St. Lawrence' in regard to seeing two comets at sea, an account of which has been published in the *American*." The mate thought that the two could not be the same comet, because, if so, it must have moved in the sky from *west* to *east* during the night. And even a "gentleman from Boston," a passenger on the ship, could give him no light on the matter. The article closes with: "In reply to the question as to whether he was positive of the correctness of his statement as to the positions of the comets, the mate asserted that he had been very particular in taking the bearings with the compass."

Every elementary astronomy teaches that comets' tails point *always* from the sun, so that in the evening, when the sun has recently set, and is below the western horizon, the tail, in pointing away from it, would lean to the east. But in the morning, before sunrise, the sun is below the eastern horizon, and the tail must lean toward the west. As to its motion from west to east, it is almost inconceivable that a ship's mate should never have noticed that the northern stars all move in circles around the North Pole or North Star; and those near the North Star, when passing under the Pole, must always seem to be moving from west to east. The well-known "dipper" is so near the North Pole that, in this latitude, it never sets, and, as it circles around the Pole, passes under it from west to east every twenty-four hours; during half the year, it may be seen every night, below the north star, and passing under it from west to east. We hope this will make it clear to the mate and the "gentleman from Boston," how the same comet could take the two positions in which they saw it.

A short time since, a reporter for one of our leading dailies—a graduate of the Philadelphia High School,—astonished a scientific man, whom he was interviewing upon the comet, by asking, "How the earth was kept from falling into the sun, anyhow?" His own view of the matter turned out to be, that the attraction of the outside planets upon the earth counterbalanced the sun's attraction upon it, and thus kept it continually revolving in the same orbit. The obvious fact that most and even all of these planets are sometimes together on the other side of the sun, and would, therefore, assist the sun in drawing the earth into itself, seemed never to have suggested itself to him.

Almost worse was the reply of another widely-read Philadelphia daily to a correspondent, a few months ago. An observant reader had asked why the sun and moon always seem largest when rising or setting, and was gravely informed, through the columns of the paper, that "the phenomena was due to refraction." This is a simple optical illusion, which is explained in all the school books upon natural philosophy; but it is one with which refraction has nothing at all to do.

Four years ago, Professor Hall, by the most careful observation with the best telescope in the world, made his remarkable discovery of the two minute satellites of Mars. Very soon after, the newspapers and the people had cultivated their powers of vision so successfully, that they were seeing the moons by looking at the image of the planet in a common looking-glass. Had they turned their powerful instruments upon the fixed stars, or upon the moon itself, they would have immortalized themselves by discovering satellites of these bodies. As a matter of fact, the moons of Mars can only be seen by the best telescopes, and by them only for the few months that Mars is nearest to the earth. Not a telescope in the world would show them now. The moons in the looking-glass were really faint reflections of the planet itself from the surfaces of the glass, the main image being reflected from the quicksilver behind the glass. A metallic mirror would have eclipsed the satellites permanently.

AUTHORS AND PUBLISHERS.

DR. H. SEUSE DENIFLE is a Roman Catholic scholar who is making a great name by his researches into the mediæval theology of Germany, especially that of the great mystical school founded by Master Eckhart. His last notable "find" has been a number of Eckhart's Latin works, this notable thinker having been known to us only through the German writings, sayings and sermons published by Franz Pfeiffer (1857,) and supplemented by Ad. Lasson (1858,) and W. Preger. The most notable piece of his literary criticism is his exposure of the true character of the "Historia" which is generally prefixed to the writings of John Tauler, the great Strasburg preacher, and which is supposed to describe Tauler's conversion through the teaching of "the Friend of God from the Oberland," whom Carl Schmidt identified with Nicolaus of Basle. This "Historia" does not give the proper names of any person, but it has always been supposed to relate to Tauler, and in many editions the Bible is printed with Tauler's name inserted. It will be found in Miss Winkworth's translation of some of his sermons; and either that or another English translation was printed in this country by the Duncans some ten years back. Dr. Denifle shows that it cannot relate to Tauler; that many of the most important circumstances in the story are inconsistent with well ascertained facts of Tauler's life; that the sermons it contains are not in the style of that great preacher, and that they display an ignorance and an indiscreetness which no one would think of charging to Tauler. He proceeds to show that this is one of a large number of theological fictions, all seemingly from the same hand, which were written to discredit the Church and its priesthood, and in the interest of an unchurchly mysticism. A good number of these were collected not long ago, and published by the late Carl Schmidt as the writings of Nicolaus of Basle. (N. v. B., *Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften*, 1866.) All that we really know of Nicolaus is that he was burned as a heretic. There is no authority in the world for ascribing to him a line of any existing writing, or for assuming that he was "the Friend of God from the Oberland." Dr. Denifle shows that he cannot have been this mysterious character, and that Dr. Schmidt has built up a romance upon the basis of writings which are no better than religious romances, but which he has taken for history. His disciples so far admit this as to seek some other person to identify with "the Friend of God from the Oberland;" and in the new edition of Herzog's *Realencyclopædie* John of Goch is designated as "the Friend," on the ground that the specifications of distances in the "Historia," which Dr. Denifle showed to be impossible for a resident of Basle, will suit John of Goch. As Dr. Carl Schmidt's view of this period and its personages has found its way into other English works besides that of Miss Winkworth, Dr. Denifle's correction of it has an importance beyond the boundaries of Germany. The very first time we read one of Dr. Schmidt's productions, we were struck with the lack of sobriety of judgment. Dr. Denifle, who, like Eckhart and Tauler, belongs to the Dominican Order, is helping in the preparation of the new edition of the works of Thomas Aquinas, the great theologian of the Order, which the present Pope is setting on foot. He has found for that purpose MSS. of great antiquity in the Library of the University of Leipzig.

"We are surfeited," says *The Spectator*, "with Shakespearean essays and lectures. If Coleridge should 'revisit the pale glimpses of the moon,' and give a fresh course, we would not attend them. If Goethe should analyze 'Othello' in a second 'Wilhelm Meister,' we would not read it. An unlettered man of rank is said to have been bored by 'Hamlet,' because he found the play too full of quotations. The story may be apocryphal, but it will serve to illustrate our feelings. All that can be said to the purpose about the life and writings of Shakespeare, has been said already, not seven times, but seventy times seven."

Mr. Richard Grant White recently has repeated the common misstatement that the theatre was proscribed in Commonwealth times. More careful research shows that one of the London theatres was open throughout the reign of the Lord Protector.

It was Goethe who said of Kant, in the "Xenien," that his intellectual wealth was shown by the vast crowd of beggars he supported, in the capacity of commentators and the like. The centennial of the "Kritik" is to be the occasion of the most elaborate edition ever issued. It will be the work of Dr. H. Vaihinger, of Strasburg, and will fill four considerable volumes. Besides a general introduction, the work will contain a running commentary on the text, logical analysis of each section, with quotations of parallel passages, and constant reference to the great men of exegetical literature, both German and foreign, which has appeared during the century.

Søren Kierkegaard is, next to Grundtvig, the most considerable figure in the theological literature of Denmark. Outside of his own country, he is known to the world by a few German translations, some of them very badly done. He was a man of as much originality as Lessing, and not altogether unlike him. He has the same wonderful clearness and definiteness in style, the same love of terse and almost paradoxical statement, and something of the same curious external relation to the theological controversies of his age. He differed from Lessing in being more of a philosopher and less of a critic than he, and in being definitely, positively, and even polemically, Christian. Indeed, in Kierkegaard's view, he himself was about the only Christian in Christendom, and nothing could be more keen than his criticism, not only of the State Church, but of all the sects and parties in Denmark. He took an intensely acetic view of Christianity, maintaining that the Christianity in vogue was little better than a self-indulgent paganism. The publication of his posthumous papers has just been completed by Dr. H. Gottsched, a German who learned Danish for

the express purpose of reading Kierkegaard's works. Finding that the work of publication was likely to cease with the third volume, he resigned his place in a German gymnasium, and went to Copenhagen to insure its completion, adding five more volumes to those already issued. The most interesting part of the work is Kierkegaard's diary, which shows the development of his thoughts on the themes which occupy his writings.

The death of George Borrow will be felt as a personal loss in a wide circle of readers. Mr. Borrow was not an author of very high rank, but he was one of those who win the personal regard of their readers. His chatty, egotistical, and generally autobiographical books are not so well known to readers of this generation as they should be. They are breezy, wholesome, and even instructive reading, although overflowing with British and anti-Catholic prejudice. Besides this, he had the rare gift of making the reader know the persons and see the places he wrote about. The highest point he ever reached is his "Bible in Spain," which the *Quarterly Review* called "a 'Gil Blas' in water colors." His "Wild Wales" is the only book we have ever seen which gives one a definite idea of the principality and its people. But his two autobiographical stories—"Lavengro" and "Romany Rye,"—are unique performances. Stories in strictness they are not, but a new species in literature. Mr. Borrow was the first to take an interest in the gipsies, and to study their character and their language. As a linguist, he compares with Mezzofanti, one of his books—"The Targum,"—containing translations from thirty languages. But he lacked sadly the scientific precision which characterizes the genuine philologist.

Mr. Grant Allen, in reviewing, in *The Academy*, Mr. John Burroughs's "Pepacton," published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., says it is a delightful book; and yet it would be difficult wholly to explain its charm, and barbarous to appraise it by giving a single paragraph or so, as a selected sample. Its merit belongs to that sort which consists in the apt mixture of nature and art, of wild scenery and open air, with literary allusion and cultivated thought. It has always the delicate aroma of a book-learned and poetical mind, intermixed with a strong love for close observation of natural objects, and just so much easy science as does not suffice to deter the merely dilettante reader.

Some volumes containing accounts of early travel are to be published by the Hakluyt Society. The first is a collection of the voyages of Baffin, edited by Mr. Clements R. Markham, C. B., F. R. S.; the other relates to the Portuguese mission of Alvarez to the Prester John, translated and edited by Lord Stanley of Alderley.

It is stated that Messrs. G. Bell & Sons, of London, are shortly to publish a historical catalogue of the pictures in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court, with notes by Mr. E. Law. The compiler has made researches among the inventories of Henry VIII., Charles I., the Commonwealth, James II., Queen Anne, etc., and in the State papers and other records.

The *Pull Mall Gazette* says: "The *Cyclopedia of Humour*, is the name of a new book which Mark Twain has now in hand. He has also in preparation a 'Hand-book of Etiquette.'"

It is reported in London that the manuscript of Dr. Kinns's harmony of the Bible and science, to be called "Moses and Geology," is nearly ready for the printer.

Mr. Moses King, the indefatigable student-publisher, sends us a tastefully bound and printed little book, entitled "Harvard and its Surroundings," which is really a complete guide to classic Cambridge. It was written and compiled by Mr. King, and has won such deserved popularity that it has attained a third edition. It is published by Charles W. Sever, and contains ninety-four pages, a number of good heliotypes, by the Heliotype Company, sketches by H. M. Stephenson, and designs by L. S. Ipsen, the clever artist who designed so many beautiful things for the great Longfellow edition of Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The *Academy* says the "new and revised edition" of Mrs. Cowden Clarke's old "Concordance to Shakspeare," now issuing in parts by Messrs. Bickers, and called the "Concordance to Shakspeare," is only a reprint from the old stereotyped plates, with two fresh pages of "Preface to the New Edition," and a list of 122 lines omitted in the old "Concordance," and, of course, also in the "new," because this is only the old edition. The "Concordance" professes on its title-page to be "complete;" but the original preface—now the second preface,—rightly confesses that the "Concordance" is not complete, even for the poet's dramatic works, as most of the auxiliaries, interjections, conjunctions, etc., are omitted. The truth is that the time has come for a new "Concordance to Shakspeare" which shall really be a complete one to all his works, his poems, and his part of the "Two Noble Kinsmen," as well as the rest of his dramas; which shall refer to the number of lines as well as those of acts and scenes, shall distinguish the meanings and parts of speech of each catchword, and shall mark, with a (+) or otherwise, the words and sentences in the parts of "Henry VI.," the "Shrew," "Timon," and "Henry VII.," attributed by the best critics to other authors. We hope that Messrs. Bickers, or some other spirited publisher, will soon undertake this new and really complete "Concordance to Shakspeare," which is greatly wanted by students.

Messrs. J. R. Osgood & Co. announce the early publication of a magnificent holiday gift book,—a new edition of Owen Meredith's "Lucille." It is to be a fine-art edition, every way worthy to rank with some of the best of the splendid works that Boston has produced in the last two years. The drawings are by Mary Halleck Foote, E. H. Garrett, E. P. Hayden, L. S. Ipsen, F. E. Lummis, Thomas Moran, W. P. Snyder, J. E. Palmer, Granville Perkins, F. B. Schell, A. R. Waud, W. L. Sheppard, F. Hopkinson Smith and James D. Smillie. The engraving has been entrusted to A. V. S. Anthony, John Andrew & Son, V. Chandler, E. Clement, W. B. Closson, T. Cole, W. J. Dana, A. Hayman, G. E. Johnson, J. Karst, F. S. King, G. Kruell, W. J. Linton, G. C. Lowenthal, W. H. Morse, N. Orr, Russell & Richardson, J. T. Speer, R. Varley and W. M. Tenny; and it has been faithfully done. The volume will make 330 large octavo pages, and will be bound with full gilt edges. It will appear in September.

Mr. George W. Harlan, of New York, has issued in cheap form Frederick Spielhagen's very interesting story,—*"The Skeleton in the House."* The story is one of Spielhagen's better sketches, and is thoroughly interesting. The translation has been well done by M. J. Safford.

The excellent oration and fine poem delivered last Memorial Day before the Grand Army Posts of Suffolk County, by Governor Long, of Massachusetts, and Col. Thomas W. Higginson, have been published in pamphlet form by Lockwood, Brooks & Co., of Boston.

Messrs. E. J. Hall & Son, of New York, have published a reply to the lectures of Robert G. Ingersoll, by Allan B. Magruder, a layman and Bible student. Mr. Magruder occupies 142 pages in his reply, and, whatever the merits of his reply, it is interesting for its earnestness.

Kegan Paul & Co., of London, are going to bring out an English edition of the admirable "Young Folks' Cyclopedia," published in this country by Henry Holt & Co. American literary work is slowly and surely making its way in England.

Messrs. Henry Holt & Co. think of publishing, in their "Little Handbook Series," the "Handbook of English Literature, for the use of candidates for examinations, public schools, and students generally," written by H. A. Dobson, of the Board of Trade, the editor of the "Civil Service History of England." It is in its second edition in England.

THE AMERICAN

A NATIONAL SEMI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF POLITICS,
LITERATURE, SCIENCE, ART,
AND FINANCE.

Published every Wednesday and Saturday at No. 726 CHESTNUT
STREET, Philadelphia.

DELIVERED BY MAIL OR CARRIER.

CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER:

	PAGE
NOTES,	273
EDITORIAL:	
Divorce in New England,	275
SPECIAL ARTICLES:	
The Legislative Pay Question,	276
"Bricks Without Straw,"	277
LITERATURE:	
Rugby, Tennessee,	278
The Three Americas Railway,	278
Baby Rue,	278
Patty's Perversities,	278
Lorimer and Wife,	278
POPULAR FALLACIES,	278
AUTHORS AND PUBLISHERS,	279

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Three Dollars a year.

The American is not stopped at expiration of subscription
unless requested.

Remittances at risk of subscriber, unless made by registered
letter, or by check or postal order payable to W. R. Balch,
Managing Editor The American.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

Twelve Cents per line per insertion for outside pages; ten
cents per line per insertion for inside pages.

No objectionable advertisements or objectionable cuts will be
accepted. Shorter advertisements may be moved to admit whole
or half pages.

The American is sent free to those advertising in it.

All communications or contributions should be addressed to
W. R. Balch, Managing Editor

THE AMERICAN,

Box 1090, Philadelphia, Pa.

Office, 726 Chestnut Street.

The New York Office of THE AMERICAN is at 55 Broadway.
The London Office of THE AMERICAN is No. 4 Trafalgar
Square, Mr. B. F. Stevens.

At each of these offices copies of THE AMERICAN can be ob-
tained, and subscriptions and advertisements will be received.

Columbia Umbrellas ARE THE MOST DURABLE.

None genuine unless stamped on handle: "COLUMBIA,"
FAST COLOR, DROWN & CO., MAKERS. Are made of
FINE SOFT GINGHAM, will not turn brown or gray, or soil the most
delicate garment in dripping.

WM. A. DROWN & CO.,

SOLE MANUFACTURERS,

246 Market Street, PHILADELPHIA. | 498 and 500 Broadway,
NEW YORK.



NEW PICTURES.

We are again in receipt of Beautiful
New Engravings, New Pho-
tographs, Etc., of every charac-
ter, suitable for Home Decoration
and Bridal Gifts. Also in stock
all the

ROGERS GROUPS.
SOLE AGENCY.

Circulars on application. The
latest ones "Is it so Nominated in
the Bond?" and "The Referee,"
being very popular. New Small
Tiles, Panels, Small Colored Photographs, &c.

NEW STYLE MIRRORS. NEW PAINTINGS. PICTURE FRAMES.

JAMES S. EARLE & SONS,

816 CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

Orders by mail receive Prompt and Full Attention. Telephone.

Entered at the Philadelphia Post-Office as
Second-Class Mail Matter.

THE PHILADELPHIA TRUST,

SAFE DEPOSIT, AND INSURANCE COMPANY,
NEW FIRE AND BURGLAR-PROOF MARBLE-FRONT BRICK BUILDING,
Nos. 413, 415 and 417 CHESTNUT STREET,

CAPITAL \$1,000,000 FULL PAID.

Established for the settlement of Estates, either as Executor, Administrator, or under assignment, and for the Execution of Trusts;
also for the Safe-keeping of Securities and Valuables, and the Renting of Small Private Safes in its Indestructible Vaults.

J. L. ERRINGER, President. EDWARD S. HANDY, Vice-President. WILLIAM L. DUBOIS, Secretary and Treasurer,

DIRECTORS.

THOMAS ROBINS, JAMES L. CLAGHORN, EDWARD Y. TOWNSEND, JAMES M. AERTSEN,
J. LIVINGSTON ERRINGER, BENJ. B. COMEGYS, Hon. WM. A. PORTER, DANIEL B. CUMMINS,
R. P. McCULLAGH, AUGUSTUS HEATON, EDWARD S. HANDY, WILLIAM S. GRANT,
DANIEL HADDOCK, JR., ALEXANDER BROWN,

SHENANDOAH VALLEY R. R.

THE ONLY ALL-RAIL ROUTE TO THE

Wonderful Caverns of Luray, and for White Sulphur, Va.,

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, ROCKBRIDGE ALUM SPRINGS, SWEET CHALYBEATE SPRINGS, WARM SPRINGS
HOT SPRINGS, HEALING SPRINGS, and others on the line of the

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO RAILWAY,

COMMENCING JUNE 15, 1881.

Cars will leave Pennsylvania Railroad Station, NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA.
For LURAY, 4.25 A. M. 9.00 A. M.
For WHITE SULPHUR, 8.30 P. M. 11.55 P. M.

PULLMAN SLEEPING CARS on 8.30 P. M. train, from New York and 11.55 P. M. train, from Philadelphia, go through to White
Sulphur.

Passengers for the Springs have the privilege of stopping over at Luray to visit the Caverns. No special change in attire is requisite to enter.
For Tickets and Information, apply to the Ticket Offices of the Pennsylvania Railroad. General Offices of the Company,
Hagerstown, Md., or 37 and 39 South Third Street, Philadelphia.

CHAS. P. HATCH, General Passenger Agent.

JOS. H. SANDS, Superintendent.

Security from loss by Burglary, Robbery, Fire or Accident.

THE FIDELITY

INSURANCE, TRUST AND SAFE DEPOSIT COMPANY,
OF PHILADELPHIA,
IN THEIR NEW MARBLE FIRE-PROOF BUILDING,
327-331 CHESTNUT STREET.

CHARTER PERPETUAL.

CAPITAL, \$2,000,000.

The Company also rent SAFES INSIDE THEIR BURGLAR-
PROOF VAULTS, at prices varying from \$15 to \$75, according to
size. An extra size for Corporations and Bankers; also, desirable
Safes in upper vault for \$10. Rooms and desks adjoining vaults
provided for Safe-Renters.

VAULT DOORS GUARDED BY THE VALE TIME-LOCK.

SECURITIES AND VALUABLES of every description, in-
cluding BONDS and STOCKS, PLATE, JEWELRY, DEEDS,
&c., taken for SAFE KEEPING, on SPECIAL GUARANTEE,
at the Lowest Rates.

DEPOSITS OF MONEY RECEIVED ON INTEREST.

INCOME COLLECTED and remitted for a moderate charge.

The Company act as EXECUTORS, ADMINISTRATORS
and GUARDIANS, and RECEIVE AND EXECUTE TRUSTS
of every description, from the courts, corporations and individuals.

ALL TRUST FUNDS AND INVESTMENTS are kept sepa-
rate and apart from the assets of the Company. As additional
security, the Company have a Special Trust Capital of \$1,000,000,
primarily responsible for their Trust obligations.

WILLS RECEIPTED FOR and safely kept without charge.

STEPHEN A. CALDWELL, President.

JOHN B. GEST, Vice-President, and in charge of the Trust
Department.

ROBERT PATTERSON, Treasurer and Secretary.

DIRECTORS:

Stephen A. Caldwell, William H. Merrick,
Edward W. Clark, John B. Gest,
Alexander Henry, Edward T. Steel,
George F. Tyler, Thomas Drake,
Henry C. Gibson, Thomas McKean,
C. A. Griscom.

—THE—

PENN MONTHLY

FOR AUGUST, 1881.

CONTENTS:

Art Museums and their Uses.—Dalton Dorr.

Cimabue and Giotto. I.—

William de Beauvoir Fryer.

Samuel Stehman Haldeman,—

Charles Henry Hart.

Primary Elections—Reform in the Delegate
System of Nominations,—

Edward Fenno Hoffman.

University Items,

Brief Mention, New Books,

Books Received, &c.

EDWARD STERN & CO., Publishers,

Philadelphia.

Barker Brothers & Co.

Bankers and Brokers,

28 SOUTH THIRD STREET,

Philadelphia.

Execute orders for Stocks, Bonds, allow
Interest on Deposits, and transact a general
Banking and Brokerage Business.

The Wharton Railroad Switch Co.

ABRAHAM BARKER, Pres.
WM. WHARTON, JR., Supt.
WHARTON BARKER, Treas.

SAFETY RAILROAD SWITCH

—with—

MAIN TRACK UNBROKEN,

Railroad Crossings, Frogs, and other
Railroad Supplies.

Manufactured by

THE WHARTON RAILROAD
SWITCH CO.

Office, 28 South Third Street,

Works, 23d and Washington Ave.

PHILADELPHIA.

WANTED.—By a plain, intelligent young man, who writes
a good hand and spells correctly, a permanent position as
amanuensis or copyist. Reasonable salary expected. Address,
J. H., Box 9, Prosperity, S. C.